DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 142 PS 010 357

AUTHOR Prusso, Kenneth W.
TITLE Get Set Day Care: 1976-1977 Summary Report. Report No. 7865.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 76p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Child Development; *Day Care Programs; *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Early Experience; Health Services; Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; Social Services; Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Get Set Day Care Program; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

The results of an evaluation of the Philadelphia Get Set Day Care Program are reported for five program components: child development, social services, health services, staff development and parent involvement. Findings with regard to the child development component showed that: (1) the program provided a moderate level of emphasis in most areas of development, (2) adults tended to provide direct intervention and leadership in the classroom, and (3) children's prekindergarten experiences in Get Set enhanced their school achievement in reading and mathematics. Examination of the social service component revealed that Get Set social service workers were in contact with families slightly more often than social service workers in other programs. The health service evaluation showed that the health and psychological services in Get Set were consistent in scope with other programs which have mandated services. With regard to staff development, staff members reported feeling that: (1) the supervisory support and workshops enhanced their classroom effectiveness, (2) they were willing to receive further training without reimbursement, and (3) they desired more release time for staff development. Future staff development concerns focused on curriculum development, creative arts, and social behaviors. Parent volunteers reported attending meetings and workshops more than helping in the classrooms and indicated that they saw fundraising as one of their primary responsibilities. Supporting data are presented in the appendices which comprise more than half of the document. (JMB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164142

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

GET SET DAY CARE

1976-1977 SUMMARY REPORT

Report Prepared By:
Kenneth W. Prusso
of the
Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report #7865

December, 1977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Constance E. Clayton
Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director
Office of Research and
Evaluation

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

PS 010357

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philadelphia School Dist., Off. Res. + Eval.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS
Constance E. Clayton
Executive Director

PROGRAMS	DIRECTORS
Child Care	Rachel Hill
Classroom Aides	Leontine D. Scott
Durham Child Development Center	Shively Willingham
Follow Through (Original, Title I Expansion, Primary Skills, Project Bridge)	Leontine D. Scott
Get Set Day Care (Day Care Training)	Bertram Snead
Kindergarten	Constance E. Clayton
Learning Centers	Lore Rasmussen
Parent Cooperative Nurseries	Rachel Hill
Prekindergarten Head Start	Elaine Spain

Note: During 1976-1977, Frances Becker was Director of the Education of Young Children, including Child Care, Kindergarten and Parent Cooperative Nurseries. Rachel Hill was Director of Day Care Services in 1976-1977.

ABSTRACT

Children's prekindergarten experiences in the Get Set Day Care Program enhanced their school achievement in Reading and Mathematics. A greater proportion of Get Set graduates achieved at or above the 50th percentile in school tests than did the group of all prekindergarten "graduates" and the group of all children tested. The program offered equal amounts of Free Play, Structured Activity, and Routines and provided a moderate level of emphasis in all areas of development (when compared to other prekindergarten programs). One exception was a lower amount of Fine Motor Manipulation emphasis. Adults' roles in the classes tended to be of a direct intervention and leadership character.

The staff appeared to appreciate the supervisory support and workshops which they felt enhanced their classroom effectiveness. Future staff development concerns focused on curriculum development, creative arts, and social behaviors. There was a willingness to receive staff development in these and other areas without reimbursement, although there was also a desire for more release time for that purpose. One possible implication of the data suggests that the staff development should take place through in-class training rather than through workshops.

Supportive Services Staff (Health and Psychological) provided a wide variety of support, identification, and remediation activities compared to programs which had no mandated services of this nature. Social Service workers were in contact with families more often than in other programs although the total contacts per worker was less. Parent Volunteers attended meetings and workshops more than they have help in the classroom. This seemed to be true of day care related programs where parents were working. They saw fund raising as one of their primary responsibilities.

GET SET DAY CARE

1976-1977 SUMMARY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Get Set Day Care has completed its seventh year of operation as an agency funded through the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare (Title XX of the Social Service Act) and the School District of Philadelphia. (It has functioned as the School District's Head Start program for almost ten years prior to that). It is a day care program which enrolls children three through sixteen years of age, although the majority of its children are three through five years of age. In 1976-1977 it operated in 92 sites (mainly churches and community centers) from 7:A.M. to 6:P.M. week days, and it served approximately 4500 children. It provided a range of services to children and their families (since it is a social service program) principally through the following components: Child Development, Social Services, Health Services, Staff Development, Parent Involvement, and Nutrition Services. During the 1976-1977 year these areas were the focus of evaluation activities conducted by the Early Childhood Evaluation Unit (ECEU), except for the area of Nutrition Services. A brief summary of each of the component area reports regarding Get Set Day Care follows. The appendices contain the relevent portions of the component reports and other supporting data.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation of the Child Development component focused upon two major areas. The first area depended upon observation data at the sites. The

second area depended upon school achievement data of Get Set "graduates" made available for the first time through the unit's Early Childhood File. Children who had been in Get Set and who had since progressed into Kindergarten, First, and Second grades participated in the School District's City Wide Testing Program. Thus, although their achievement test results were not immediate consequences of the program, they reflect the program's long term influence.

Classroom Observation Data

The following data are based on observations at twenty-five percent of the sites. Almost 400 observations were made in two rounds during the winter of 1976 and the spring of 1977. (Tabular summaries are found in Appendix A). Observation data documented that most care groups averaged thirteen children in size, and were lead by one teacher and one aide yielding an adult to child ratio of 1:6. Children were observed to be working either as one group or (slightly less often) in five or more groups. Typically they would be seated at table areas.

The variety of materials in use tended to concentrate in five categories: Paints and Brushes; Scissors/Crayon/Paste; Pencils/Pens/Blank Paper; Housekeeping Things (pots, pans); and Letters/Words/Numerals (props). The materials pertaining to large muscle development were observed in use, but no single item was identified to be frequently in use.

The observations also established that the program had an equal emphasis on activities falling into three of the four major activity areas. Free

Play, Structured Activities, and Routines were observed in equal proportion (roughly), while Outdoor Play was observed to a lesser extent. (Nursery school programs seem to place less emphasis on Routines than do day care programs.)

Observers analyzed the developmental components of each activity in which children were engaged. The relative emphasis of each developmental area was calculated to characterize the program "curriculum" (see Appendix A, page 4). In rank order, the emphases were: Social Interaction/Rapport; Language/Vocabulary; Social Responsibility/Self Help; Gross Motor; Fine Motor Manipulation; Ideation/Math-Logic; and Fine Motor Draw/Write. Relative to the other programs, the Developmental Emphases of the Get Set program tended to represent numerically the middle ground for all areas except Fine Motor Manipulation (which was low compared to the other programs).

As a means of describing the various prekindergarten programs, each was characterized by the extent to which adults engaged in six roles. Each role was defined by categorized behaviors (see Appendix A, page 5). Compared to an average for all programs, Get Set adults working with children tended to be engaged more in Structurer and Enforcer roles. Story Teller/Song Leader and Direct Teacher roles received a moderate emphasis (compared to other programs). Indirect Teacher and Nurturer roles were engaged in less than in other programs.

The overall characterization of the program tended to show little variation from a general composite "picture" of all the prekindergarten programs

evaluated. For morning hours of care, the program presented to children appeared to have equal amounts of directed and undirected learning opportunities as well as "eating and self care" (routine) opportunities.

Developmental data are being collected for the first time during the 1977-1978 school year. The data will be gathered through the use of the Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC) and will be correlated with the observed developmental emphasis of the program.

Children's Achievement

By the 1976-1977 academic year, three years of data from the City-Wide Testing Program were available for prekindergarten program graduates. The test results are examined here as evidence of the long-term benefits resulting from prekindergarten program experiences.

Tables in Appendix B display the percentage of children who achieved "below the 16th percentile" as well as "at-or-above the 50th percentile" in Reading and Mathematics. Data for three grades were available -- Kindergarten, First Grade and Second Grade. Groups of children were identified according to three criteria regarding their prekindergarten experiences: all children tested regardless of previous experience; all children tested who also were known prekindergarten "graduates;" and all children tested who were Get Set Day Care graduates.

To analyze the data, only the differences in percentages of children achieving "at or above the 50th percentile" in each of the areas of Reading and Mathematics were considered since the range included the majority of children in the three grades. That is, Kindergarten children tended to exceed the 50th percentile (so called "grade level") in both Reading (Letters

and Sounds) and Mathematics.

Based upon the comparisons between two groups (the group of children who had any prekindergarten program experience and the more inclusive group of all children in each grade) the following relationships were found:

1. The proportion of children who attained a Total Reading score at or above the 50th percentile was greater for prekindergarten graduates than for the total group tested in Kindergarten and in Grades One and Two.

2. The proportion of children who attained a Total Mathematics score at or above the 50th percentile was greater for prekindergarten graduates than for the total group tested in Grades One and Two.

Based upon comparisons made in a similar manner between the group of children who had any known prekindergarten experience and the group who had the Get Set Day Care experience, the following relationships were found:

1. The proportion of children attaining a Total Reading score at or above the 50th percentile was greater for Get Set graduates than for the total prekindergarten graduates in Kindergarten and Grades One and Two.

2. The proportion of children attaining a Total Mathematics score at or above the 50th percentile was greater for Get Set graduates than for the total prekindergarten graduates in Grade One. The proportions were equal for the two groups in Kindergarten and Grade Two.

In conclusion, a greater proportion of the Get Set Day Care graduates attained test scores at or above the 50th percentile in Reading and Mathematics than did the group of all children tested. Further, the Get Set graduates did better than the general group of prekindergarten graduates in Reading, and as well or better in Mathematics.

SOCIAL SERVICES (See Appendix C)

Data in this area were collected from the program's Social Service Personal Monthly Report. Items similar in meaning to those on a general Social Services Report Form developed by the ECEU were incorporated in an overall comparison of the various programs.

In general, Get Set's Social Service component had the highest number of social service workers to number of children (1:73) among the programs evaluated. From an analysis of three methods of contact with families (phone, home visit, and conference at the center) it was clear that phone contacts (54% of all contacts) and center conferences (41% of all contacts) predominated, rather than home visits (5%). The social service workers, however, were in contact with families, on the average, more than 6 times during the 9 month reporting period, the highest average among the programs. Each social service worker made on the average, a total of 378 contacts. In other programs where there were fewer workers per child the total number of contacts per worker was higher. Ninety-one percent of the contacts were for the purpose of providing information or acting as a liaison between the program and the home. The next largest percentage of contacts was for Admissions and Recruitment (8%).

In conclusion, the Get Set Social Service Workers were in contact with families slightly more often than Social Service Workers in other programs, but made fewer average number of contacts per worker overall.

HEALTH SERVICES (See Appendix D)

Get Set Health Services efforts were directed principally toward (1) identification and correction of health problems, (2) utilization of health agencies, and (3) health education. (Nutritional services were also provided in the program, both through nutrition education and through two snacks and one meal a day).

Sixty-six percent (or 2,959) of the children received physical examinations, 17% of whom were diagnosed as needing health care. Dental problems represented 54% of the diagnosed needs. Other needs were vision (14%), chest (11%), skin (8%), nutrition (5%), and other (8%). Of those diagnosed, 38% received treatment, most often at a health clinic.

Psychological services were also provided, primarily through observation and referral. About 15% of the children were observed, and two thirds of these (N=395) were evaluated as having problems. Most of these were categorized as "problem behaviors" (physically aggressive behavior or social-emotional maladjustment).

The psychological staff also made about 600 contacts with instructional staff (regarding children's behaviors) and another 125 approximate contacts with staff handling "special" day care groups. Further, the psychological staff conducted 154 parent conferences (in group or individual settings) to discuss children's developmental problems (two-thirds of the time) or to serve as a resource person during such meetings. Many other contacts were made for training and consultation with program staff (approximately 2200

such contacts for consultation alone).

In conclusion, the health and psychological services in Get Set are consistent in scope with other programs which have mandated services, and exceed in the extent of delivery compared to programs without mandated services.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT (See Appendix E)

Questionnaires developed by the ECEU were distributed to all Get Set field supervisors, and a sample of 271 teachers, assistant teachers, and aides (about 3 per site) in the Spring of 1977. Eighty-four teachers and 48 aides returned completed questionnaires, representing 45% of the sample. Seven of the eleven field supervisors (64%) returned questionnaires. Results are reported as a percentage of returns.

Get Set teachers principally attended workshops offered by the program or Title XX trainers, rather than outside agencies. They also attended meetings bearing on staff development at local program sites more frequently than outside locations. Aides and assistant teachers also attended these three types of staff development sessions more frequently, but in small proportions than the teachers.

Regarding supervisory support, teachers reported having on-site consultations with supervisory staff at least once a month, but less than half reported receiving on-site teaching assistance, and less than a third attended workshops. A greater percentage of aides reported receiving these types of support.

The majority of teachers and aides reported satisfaction with eight of ten selected supervisory services. (See Appendix E, page 9, for a complete list of service items). The four areas reported most satisfactory were: (1) offering support in parent involvement, (2) giving support for individual concerns, (3) providing program information, and (4) helping to solve classroom management problems. Areas which were not satisfactory to the majority were (for teachers) on-site classroom training and conducting workshops, and (for assistant teachers and aides) on-site classroom training and arranging use of professional days.

The staff development topics felt to be the most effective, were: (1) child abuse and neglect, (2) learning disabilities, (3) social behavior, (4) creative arts, (5) effective use of space, and (6) curriculum development. However, for future staff development, the desired topics were (1) curriculum development, (2) creative arts, and (3) social behavior.

Supervisors had three priority areas for future staff development. These were human relations, parent involvement, and child development.

The majority of teachers responding indicated they would be willing to attend the staff development without reimbursement for the following areas (a list of areas is given in Appendix E, page 15): (1) Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum, (2) Curriculum Development, (3) Growth and Development Issues, (4) Classroom Management, (5) Learning Disabilities, (6) Social Behaviors, and (7) Parent Involvement. The majority of assistant teachers and aides responding also indicated that they would be willing to attend these staff development sessions without reimbursement (Appendix E, page 17, displays the entire list).

Although the respondents indicated satisfaction with staff development offered, it is of interest to note the underlying desire for more, apparently in a more direct or personal manner of delivery. The areas which the staff believed had the greatest impact on their work with children were also the areas selected for future staff development. The least satisfaction expressed was both with the lack of on-site classroom training and with the most commonly offered mode of staff development, namely conducting workshops.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT (See Appendix F)

Parents are encouraged to participate in Title XX day care programs according to state guidelines. Each center has a Parent Council which plans activities for parents and children. There are also Area Councils and a City-wide Parent Council comprised of representatives from the centers.

The respondents for each center's Parent Council indicated on a questionnaire that most of their time was spent in fund raising, planning social activities, and participating in educational activities.

Parents volunteered a total of 25,562 hours to the program, 3,707 of which was spent in the "classrooms". However, more total time was spent in attending general workshops and meetings. (In programs with no day care function, parents spend more time in the classroom than at meetings. This difference in volunteer emphasis is probably due to the fact that parents who work choose day care rather than other prekindergarten programs which have a shorter day.) They also helped with class trips, did volunteer work, and spent some time on other activities and planning policy. Parents attended educational and other (health, child development, etc.) workshops on an average of nine per year.

SUMMARY

The Get Set Day Care program was visited primarily during its morning hours. Use of materials was noted primarily for children's Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Social Interaction/Rapport, and Language/Vocabulary development during equal amounts of Free Play, Structured Activity, and Routine periods. The developmental aspects of the children's activities were observed to be in the middle range of emphasis compared to other programs, except for Fine Motor Manipulation which was observed less than in other programs. Adults (teachers, assistant teachers, and aides) tended to emphasize the Structurer and Enforcer roles most, Direct Teacher and Story Teller/Song Leader roles medium, and Indirect Teacher and Nurturer roles least.

Apparently the program has a long range effect in enhancing children's achievement in Reading and Mathematics through the Second Grade (the limit to which current data are available). The conclusion comes from comparisons of Get Set children's achievement to that for all children regardless of prekindergarten background and to that for children with any known prekindergarten experience.

The Social Service Workers were in contact with Get Set Day Care families slightly more often than Social Service Workers in other programs, but they made fewer total contacts per worker. Most contacts were to provide information or to act as a liaison between the family and the program.

Health Services provided a variety of identification, remediation, liaison, and educational services. Two-thirds of the children were examined, with 17% of those being identified for further health care. Most problems were dental. Almost 40% of those identified are known to have

received treatment.

The Psychological Services staff observed children as requested and identified approximately two-thirds of those as having real "problem behaviors." The staff also made 725 contacts with instructional staff regarding the children, conducted 54 parent conferences, and made 2,200 additional contacts for general consultation.

Staff Development questionnaires were returned by 45% of the sample selected consisting of 271 teachers, assistant teachers, and aides. Teachers and aides were generally satisfied with their supervisor's services, identified six areas of staff development which they thought had improved their "classroom" effectiveness and wanted three of those areas for future staff development (curriculum development, creative arts, and social behavior).

Supervisors selected human relations, parent involvement, and child development as their priorities for future staff development.

The staff identified at least seven areas for which the majority would be willing to accept staff development without reimbursement, although they also indicated a desire for more release time for that purpose.

The staff responses seemed to indicate a desire for more staff development on some of the same topics they felt had enhanced their effectiveness. On the other hand, the staff was least satisfied with the conduct of workshops and the lack of in-class training, perhaps indicating a desire for more individualized training.

Parents volunteered more of their time for attending workshops and meetings, and also gave help in the classrooms. They tended to see their

parent council's major function as fund raising, planning social activities, and participating in educational activities.

APPENDIX A

GET SET PKOF SUMMARY

1976-1977

ABOUT THE PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION SUMMARIES GET SET DAY CARE

The following four pages summarize the observed characteristics of your prekindergarten program according to data gathered during 1976-1977. The Prekindergarten Observation Form (PKOF) used in the process is attached for your convenience.

Five prekindergarten summaries were made, one for each of the following: Child Care, Durham & Douglass & Greenfield, Get Set Day Care, Prekindergarten Head Start, and Parent Cooperative Nurseries.

Your program's data are displayed next to comparison data selected from all five programs. You may note both what is typical or average for your program and (for most items) how it compares to the highest, lowest, and median characteristics of all the programs. (The median, where displayed, is the middle number in a rank order of numbers. For example, if five numbers in rank order are 3,6,9,17,20, then the median is the third, or middle, number, in this case "9".)

If more than one word or category is given for a characteristic, as in the case of the list of adults typically observed, the higher in the list is more predominant. In this case, teachers were present most often, then aides, and then parent volunteers.

For the page summarizing media typically in use, only those categories reported for sixteen percent or more of the observations are noted. At the bottom the number of such items is also noted.

The Development Emphasis is a percentage of a combination of time spent and children involved in observed activities. Each activity was analyzed by the observers (trained Early Childhood Evaluation Unit staff) as to its developmental aspects. These correspond, with minor variations, with the developmental categories of the Developmental Behavior Checklist finding wide use in all School District of Philadelphia prekindergarten programs this year.

Finally, interaction items were combined into Interaction Categories and given a Program Index as a convenient method of summarization. The higher the number the more that category is characteristic of the program.

GET SET DAY CARE, 1976-1977

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PREKINDERGARTEN SITES
BASED UPON PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION DATA

Information Category	Program	All Programs		
		Low	Median	High
1. Number of observation cycles (three per visit per room)	399	42	42	399
2. Percent of sites visited	25%	25%	30%	100%
3. Age of children	3-4-5	3	4	5
4. Average number of children	13	10	13	18
5. Staff and adults typically observed	Teacher Aide	Teacher Aide Parent Volunteer		
6. Average number of adults	2	(2.3)		
7. Adult to child ratio	1:6	1:8	1:6	1:2
8. Number of groups typically observed	One Group Five or More	Five or More One Group		
9. Children's typical work location	Desks Table Areas	Table Areas Floor		

GET SET DAY CARE, 1976-1977

TYPICAL MEDIA OBSERVED IN USE
IN SIXTEEN PERCENT OR MORE OF THE PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATIONS

Categories Of Materials	Program	All Program Mode
LARGE BLOCKS (6" X 1')		
LARGE TRANSPORTATION TOY-RIDING		
CLIMBER/SLIDE		
WATER TABLE/BUCKET		
SAND TABLE		
SPORTS EQUIPMENT/LARGE BALL		
BALANCE BEAM/PAINTED LINE		
WORKBENCH/TOOLS		
SMALL BALL		
UNIT BLOCKS		
PUZZLES		
PAINTS AND BRUSHES	X	X
LEGO BLOCKS/LINCOLN LOGS (EQUIV.)		
CLAY/DOUGH		
SCISSORS/CRAYONS/PASTE	X	X
PENCILS/PENS/BLANK PAPER	X	X
DOLLS/PUPPETS		
STUFFED ANIMALS-CUDDLIES		
HOUSEKEEPING THINGS (POTS/PANS)	X	X
HATS/SHOES/DRESS UP		
TRANSPORTATION - HAND HELD TOYS		
MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS		
SERIATED OBJECTS (SIZE, VOLUME, ETC.)		
PAN BALANCE (WEIGHING)		
MEASURING DEVICES (RULER/CUPS)		
PLANTS/SHELLS/OTHER COLLECTIONS		
LIVE ANIMALS (FISH, RABBIT)		
PICTURE BOOKS/STORY BOOKS		X
STORY RECORDS/TAPES		
SONG RECORDS/TAPES/MUSICAL TOYS		
WORK SHEETS (PRINTED PAPERS)		
WORKBOOKS		
LETTERS/WORDS/NUMERALS (PROPS)	X	X
Number of categories observed in use 16% or more of the time	5	Low = 5 High=15

GET SET DAY CARE, 1976-1977

ACTIVITY TYPES AND CURRICULAR EMPHASIS
BASED UPON PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION DATA

Topic	Program	Comparison Data Low	Median	High
1, Distribution of Time:				
FREE PLAY	35%	26%	35%	48%
STRUCTURED ACTIVITY	31%	23%	36%	51%
ROUTINES	26%	7%	19%	26%
OUTDOOR PLAY	8%	8%	8%	19%
2. Developmental Emphasis:				
GROSS MOTOR	21%	20%	21%	38%
FINE MOTOR MANIPULATION	19%	19%	27%	30%
FINE MOTOR DRAW-WRITE	3%	2%	3%	11%
SOCIAL INTERACTION/ RAPPORT	63%	54%	63%	73%
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY/ SELF-HELP	24%	12%	26%	28%
IDEATION--MATH/LOGIC	17%	8%	17%	24%
LANGUAGE/VOCABULARY	44%	21%	36%	47%

3. Major(25% or more) Emphasis in Activity:		All Program Mode
FREE PLAY	Social Interaction--Rapport Fine Motor Manipulation Gross Motor	Social Interaction--Rapport Fine Motor Manipulation
STRUCTURED ACTIVITY	Language/Vocabulary Social Interaction--Rapport Ideation--Math/Logic	Language/Vocabulary Social Interaction--Rapport Ideation--Math/Logic
ROUTINES	Social Interaction--Rapport Social Responsibility-- Self Help Language/Vocabulary	Social Interaction--Rapport Social Responsibility-- Self-Help Language/Vocabulary Fine Motor Manipulation
OUTDOOR PLAY	Gross Motor Social Interaction--Rapport	Gross Motor Social Interaction--Rapport

GET SET DAY CARE 1976-1977

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULT INTERACTION WITH CHILDREN

Interaction Category	Program Index	Comparison Indices Low	Median	High
STRUCTURER Adult with Group Adult Led Group Directed (Procedural)	57	35	47	59
STORY TELLER/ SONG LEADER Reading/Singing/ Telling Story	8	5	8	13
DIRECT TEACHER Showed The Children Instructed (Knowledge) Questioned (Closed) Approved Behavior	23	14	18	26
INDIRECT TEACHER Social Talk Played/Worked Along Suggested Questioned (Open)	21	16	21	32
NURTURER Got Things for Child Reflected Child's Feeling Physically Nurtured Shared Thoughts	14	11	12	15
ENFORCER Limited/Compelled Physically Restrained Dissapproved Behavior	5	3	5	9

The Program Index for each Interaction Category (e.g., STRUCTURER) is the average percentage of observations in which any item in the category occurred. The size of one Program Index may be compared to any other. Three Comparison Indices are provided for each Interaction Category so that the relationship of the given program can be found with regard to all five programs studied. The five programs included are Child Care, Durham & Douglass & Greenfield, Get Set Day Care, Prekindergarten Head Start, and Parent Cooperative Nurseries.

PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION FORM

R1 (8/77)

SITE NAME				LOG NO. (1)
SITE CODE (2)	DISTRICT (3)	ROOM NO.	MORNING (4) 1	
NAME OF OBSERVER				DATE OBSERVED

DIRECTIONS: For each item, circle '1' if the item applies or was observed.
Do NOT circle any item that does not apply or was not observed.
For all others, enter a number or tally.

ROUND

5	ONE	1
6	TWO	1

PROJECT

7	CHILD CARE	1
8	DURHAM	1
9	GET SET	1
10	PRE-K HEAD START	1
11	PARENT CO-OP NURSERY	1

AGE RANGE OF CLASS

12	3 YEARS	1
13	4 YEARS	1
14	5 YEARS	1
15	MIXED 3'S AND 4'S	1
16	MIXED 4'S AND 5'S	1
17	MIXED 3'S, 4'S, AND 5'S	1

CODE 2 MINUTES - TIME:

CYCLE ONE	CYCLE TWO	CYCLE THREE
TO	TO	TO

STAFFING

		BI-LING.	CYCLE 1	CYCLE 2	CYCLE 3
18	TEACHER	1	1	1	1
19	ASSISTANT	1	1	1	1
20	AIDE	1	1	1	1
21	PARENT VOLUNTEER	1	1	1	1
22	OTHER	1	1	1	1
23	TOTAL ADULTS ▶				
24	TOTAL CHILDREN ▶				

GROUPING

NUMBER OF GROUPS

		CYCLE 1	CYCLE 2	CYCLE 3
25	ONE	1	1	1
26	TWO	1	1	1
27	THREE	1	1	1
28	FOUR	1	1	1
29	FIVE+	1	1	1

CHILD LOCATION

30	DESKS/TABLES	1	1	1
31	TABLE AREA	1	1	1
32	FLOOR	1	1	1
33	TRANSITION	1	1	1
34	ACTIVITY CENTER	1	1	1
35	OUT OF ROOM	1	1	1
36	OTHER	1	1	1

CODE 3 MINUTES - TIME:

	CYCLE ONE	CYCLE TWO	CYCLE THREE
	TO	TO	TO

MATERIALS IN USE

37	LARGE BLOCKS (6" X 1')	1	1	1
38	LARGE TRANSPORTATION TOY-RIDING	1	1	1
39	CLIMBER/SLIDE	1	1	1
40	WATER TABLE/BUCKET	1	1	1
41	SAND TABLE	1	1	1
42	SPORTS EQUIPMENT/LARGE BALL	1	1	1
43	BALANCE BEAM/PAINTED LINE	1	1	1
44	WORKBENCH/TOOLS	1	1	1
45	SMALL BALL	1	1	1
46	UNIT BLOCKS	1	1	1
47	PUZZLES	1	1	1
48	PAINTS AND BRUSHES	1	1	1
49	LEGO BLOCKS/LINCOLN LOGS (EQUIV.)	1	1	1
50	CLAY/DOUGH	1	1	1
51	SCISSORS/CRAYONS/PASTE	1	1	1
52	PENCILS/PENS/BLANK PAPER	1	1	1
53	DOLLS/PUPPETS	1	1	1
54	STUFFED ANIMALS-CUDDLIES	1	1	1
55	HOUSEKEEPING THINGS (POTS/PANS)	1	1	1
56	HATS/SHOES/DRESS UP	1	1	1
57	TRANSPORTATION - HAND HELD TOYS	1	1	1
58	MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS	1	1	1
59	SERIATED OBJECTS (SIZE, VOLUME, ETC.)	1	1	1
60	PAN BALANCE (WEIGHING)	1	1	1
61	MEASURING DEVICES (RULER/CUPS)	1	1	1
62	PLANTS/SHELLS/OTHER COLLECTIONS	1	1	1
63	LIVE ANIMALS (FISH, RABBIT)	1	1	1
64	PICTURE BOOKS/STORY BOOKS	1	1	1
65	STORY RECORDS/TAPES	1	1	1
66	SONG RECORDS/TAPES/MUSICAL TOYS	1	1	1
67	WORK SHEETS (PRINTED PAPERS)	1	1	1
68	WORKBOOKS	1	1	1
69	LETTERS/WORDS/NUMERALS (PROPS)	1	1	1

PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION FORM - PART 2

R 1 (2/77)

SITE NAME | SITE CODE | LOG NO.

MAJOR SCHEDULED ACTIVITY
(CODE ONE PER CYCLE - ENTER IN CODE BLOCKS 71, 75, AND 79)

FREE PLAY 1
STRUCTURED ACTIVITY 2
ROUTINES 3
OUTDOOR PLAY 4

	CYCLE ONE	CYCLE TWO	CYCLE THREE
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

	CYCLE ONE						CYCLE TWO						CYCLE THREE					
	NO. OF GROUPS (70) ▶			ACTIVITY (71) ▶			NO. OF GROUPS (74) ▶			ACTIVITY (75) ▶			NO. OF GROUPS (78) ▶			ACTIVITY (79) ▶		
	1	2	3	4	5	(72)	1	2	3	4	5	(76)	1	2	3	4	5	(80)
NUMBER OF CHILDREN																		
NUMBER OF CHILDREN FOCUSED																		
GROSS MOTOR																		
FINE MOTOR-MANIPULATION																		
FINE MOTOR-DRAW/WRITE																		
SOCIAL INTERACTION-RAPPORT																		
SOCIAL REPONSIBILITY - SELF-HELP																		
IDEATION-MATH/LOGIC																		
LANGUAGE/VOCABULARY																		
KEYPUNCH FIELDS ▶						(73)						(77)						(81)
ADULTS - ACTION - ADULT WITH GROUP																		
ADULTS - ACTION - LED GROUP																		
ADULTS - ACTION - OBSERVED																		
ADULTS - ACTION - GOT THINGS FOR CHILD																		
ADULTS - ACTION - PLAYED/WORKED ALONG																		
ADULTS - ACTION - SHOWED CHILDREN THE:																		
ADULTS - ACTION - PHYSICALLY NURTURED																		
ADULTS - ACTION - PHYSICALLY RESTRAINED																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - APPROVED BEHAVIOR																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - DISAPPROVED BEHAVIOR																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - LIMITED/COMPELLED																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - SUGGESTED																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - DIRECTED (PROCEDURAL)																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - INSTRUCTED (KNOWLEDGE)																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - READ/SANG/TOLD STORY																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - QUESTIONED - CLOSED																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - QUESTIONED - OPEN																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - SHARED THOUGHTS																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - REFLECTED CHILD'S FEELINGS																		
ADULTS - VERBAL INTERACTION - SOCIAL TALK																		

APPENDIX B

GET SET DAY CARE

SCHOOL CHILDREN'S TEST PERFORMANCE

TABLE 1

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE IN READING AS A FUNCTION OF PREKINDERGARTEN EXPERIENCE: PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN SCORING WITHIN TWO MAJOR NATIONAL NORM INTERVALS, 1974-1975 THROUGH 1976-1977

(KINDERGARTEN SUBTEST=LETTERS AND SOUNDS OF THE SESAT: TOTAL READING SCORES ON THE CAT ARE USED FOR GRADES 1 AND 2)

Grade	Experience Prior To Kindergarten	Number For Each Year	% Below 16th Percentile			% At Or Above 50th Percentile		
			1974 1975	1975 1976	1976 1977	1974 1975	1975 1976	1976 1977
KINDERGARTEN	All Children With and Without Prekindergarten	1974= 18,445 1975= 19,147 1976= 18,027	4%	4%	4%	81%	82%	81%
	Any Known Prekindergarten Experience	1974= 973 1975= 1,450 1976= 1,825	3%	3%	3%	87%	86%	83%
	Only Get Set Day Care Prekindergarten	1974= 711 1975= 999 1976= 1,304	2%	3%	2%	87%	87%	85%
FIRST GRADE	All Children With and Without Prekindergarten	1975=16,907 1976=17,415	--	7%	8%	--	60%	60%
	Any Known Prekindergarten Experience	1975= 837 1976= 1,309	--	6%	5%	--	68%	65%
	Only Get Set Day Care Prekindergarten	1975= 591 1976= 899	--	6%	5%	--	69%	66%
SECOND GRADE	All Children With and Without Prekindergarten	1976=16,484	--	--	9%	--	--	59%
	Any Known Prekindergarten Experience	1976= 739	--	--	6%	--	--	67%
	Only Get Set Day Care Prekindergarten	1976= 522	--	--	6%	--	--	71%

TABLE 2

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE IN MATHEMATICS AS A FUNCTION OF PREKINDERGARTEN EXPERIENCE: PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN SCORING WITHIN TWO MAJOR NATIONAL NORM INTERVALS, 1974-1975 THROUGH 1976-1977

(KINDERGARTEN SUBTEST=MATHEMATICS OF THE SESAT: TOTAL MATHEMATICS SCORES ON THE CAT ARE USED FOR GRADES 1 AND 2)

Grade	Experience Prior To Kindergarten	Number For Each Year	% Below 16th Percentile			% At Or Above 50th Percentile		
			1974 1975	1975 1976	1976 1977	1974 1975	1975 1976	1976 1977
KINDERGARTEN	All Children With and Without Prekindergarten	1974= 18,491 1975= 19,162 1976= 18,051	11%	10%	9%	68%	69%	70%
	Any Known Prekindergarten Experience	1974= 970 1975= 1,453 1976= 1,820	8%	9%	9%	71%	70%	72%
	Only Get Set Day Care Prekindergarten	1974= 708 1975= 1,002 1976= 1,300	9%	9%	8%	71%	71%	73%
FIRST GRADE	All Children With and Without Prekindergarten	1975=17,301 1976=17,536	--	10%	9%	--	57%	59%
	Any Known Prekindergarten Experience	1975= 849 1976= 1,329	--	9%	7%	--	63%	64%
	Only Get Set Day Care Prekindergarten	1975= 599 1976= 909	--	10%	5%	--	64%	65%
SECOND GRADE	All Children With and Without Prekindergarten	1976=16,518	--	--	11%	--	--	56%
	Any Known Prekindergarten Experience	1976= 738	--	--	9%	--	--	61%
	Only Get Set Day Care Prekindergarten	1976= 521	--	--	8%	--	--	61%

APPENDIX C

GET SET DAY CARE

SOCIAL SERVICES COMPONENT

1976-1977

GET SET DAY CARE SOCIAL SERVICE COMPONENT

1976-1977

During the period covered by this report, Get Set Day Care provided service to more than 4500 children at 92 sites. Social Service Support was provided to the families of these children by a staff of 62 Social Service workers. Most of these workers were paraprofessionals and were given assistance by six of ten professionally trained Unit Leaders. (Four Unit Leader positions were vacant during the reporting period.) A Casework and Training Supervisor provided ongoing training, consultation and assistance to all of the Social Services staff, and a Social Services Coordinator had overall administrative responsibility for the component.

Data were collected from the Get Set record form "Social Services Personal Monthly Report". This form included data similar to that reported by other programs on the form designed by ECEU, but differences in the format did not permit the inclusion of certain categories of information.

A summary of the reports appears in Table C-1, which displays the relationship between the areas in which parents needed help and the method that was used to provide service. When the "Area in Which Help was Needed" was not specified in the Monthly Report, they were recorded in the Program Information/Home School Liaison category. This may, in part, account for the high tallies in this area. The mode of contact with parents was predominately by telephone (54%). Conferences at the Center account for 41% of the contacts, and another 5% were categorized as Home Visits.

Because of the unique reporting form used in Get Set, it was not possible to be more specific in the analysis of worker-parent contacts. However, it was possible to examine information about the emphasis that was placed on the type of worker-parent interaction. Data displayed in Table C-2 summarizes all contacts, with parents and others.

More than 53% of the total 43,903 contacts involved direct relationship with Get Set families. Within this group, Home Visits accounted for 2.6% of the overall total with Center Contacts and Phone Contacts accounting for 22% and almost 29% respectively. The remaining 47% of the reported contacts involved program personnel and personnel from other agencies. In this case, the modes of contact were spilt almost evenly between Phone and Center Contacts. This non-parent group of contacts may have involved staff training, referrals and conferences with teachers and supervisory personnel.

It appears that the contacts made by Social Services Staff were almost evenly divided between parent and non-parent, and in both cases the telephone was used somewhat more frequently than were face to face contacts.

Table C-3 displays the mode of contacts for the parent and non-parent categories for each reporting site or site group. There is great variation among centers in both the total numbers of contacts and the way those contacts were categorized. These data are presented for the use of Get Set program personnel who best understand the workings of the individual centers and, in making decisions, can account for the many variables involved such as center size and staffing patterns.

TABLE C-1

GET SET DAY CARE

AREAS IN WHICH PARENTS NEEDED HELP AND THE METHODS EMPLOYED BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS TO GIVE HELP

Areas in Which Help was Needed	Method of Giving Help							
	Parent Contacts by Phone Only		Home Visits		Parent Conferences at Center		Total Contacts	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Child's Attendance Problems			238	1.0			238	1.0
Child's Physical Health			36	.2			36	.2
Child's Mental Health							0	0
Family Problems			72	.3			72	.3
Program Info. Home/ School Liaison	12564	53.6	838	3.6	7790	33.3	21192	90.5
Information About Community Agencies								
Admissions and Recruitment					1882	8.0	1882	8.0
TOTALS	12564	53.6	1184	5.1	9672	41.3	23420	100

TABLE C-2

SUMMARY OF PARENT CONTACTS AND NON-PARENT CONTACTS
REPORTED BY GET SET DAY CARE SOCIAL SERVICE PERSONNEL
1976 - 1977

Contacts with Parents			Non-Parent Contacts (Contacts with Program Personnel and Personnel from other Agencies)		
	N	%		N	%
Home Visits	1184	2.7	Phone Contacts	10564	24.1
Phone Contact	12564	28.6	Center Contact	9919	22.6
Center Contact	9672	22.0	Sub Total	20485	46.7
Sub Total	23420	53.3			

Grant Total (Parent Contacts
Plus Non-Parent Contacts)

43905

TABLE C-3

GET SET DAY CARE

TYPES OF PARENT AND NON-PARENT CONTACTS
MADE BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS 1976-1977

Sites	Contacts with Parents				Contacts with Program Personnel And Personnel from Other Agencies			Grand Total (Parent Contacts Plus Non-Parent Contacts)
	Home Visits	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	
Allegheny Av. Bapt.	4	98	100	202	145	142	287	489
Bartram Vill., First Bapt.	6	330	380	716	122	117	239	955
Berean Presby.	25	169	217	411	178	157	335	746
Bethune Annex	17	131	174	322	215	200	415	737
Bright Hope	2	242	232	476	33	74	107	583
Calvary Episc. (Mt. Pisgah)	28	70	92	190	196	105	301	491
Carver	16	18	22	56	14	9	23	79
Childs Mem., Friends Guild	74	120	129	323	146	124	270	593
Christ Luth.	*							
Cookman Mem.	0	270	125	395	117	125	242	637
Coretta King	5	53	65	123	111	68	179	302
Cornerstone Bapt.	40	415	223	678	303	459	762	1,440
Corpus Christi	3	425	234	662	153	100	253	915
Crucifixion, Hawthorne	2	188	250	440	355	636	991	1,431
Elmwood Comm., Mt. Zion	10	189	136	335	84	71	155	490
Emmanuel Meth. (Brown) Morris Brown	1	30	34	65	78	112	190	255

C-5

TABLE C-3

GET SET DAY CARE

TYPES OF PARENT AND NON-PARENT CONTACTS
MADE BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS 1976-1977

Sites	Contacts with Parents				Contacts with Program Personnel And Personnel from Other Agencies			Grand Total (Parent Contacts Plus Non-Parent Contacts)
	Home Visits	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	
Emmanuel Meth. (York) Foster Mem	42	117	11	170	74	33	107	277
Enon Tab., Jones Meth.	7	105	71	183	91	88	179	362
First African	8	176	121	305	137	141	278	583
First Methodist	0	185	107	292	121	113	234	526
Gloucester House	63	183	146	392	250	178	428	820
Good News G.S.	20	226	149	395	292	217	509	904
Grace Lutheran	*							
Greater Zion, Saint Jakobus	34	305	156	495	46	29	75	570
Harrison Plaza	*							
Hattal-Taylor, Mt. Zion (Ritten)	*							
Haverford Center	5	70	87	162	48	59	107	269
Holy Communion	65	150	139	354	192	219	411	765
Holy Cross, Church of God	2	211	191	404	154	193	347	751
Holy Trinity, Smith School	4	285	185	474	177	193	370	844
House of Prayer	0	54	37	91	123	123	246	337
Houston Comm., Russell Taber.	2	405	447	854	503	412	915	1,769

TABLE C-3

GET SET DAY CARE

TYPES OF PARENT AND NON-PARENT CONTACTS
MADE BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS 1976-1977

Sites	Contacts with Parents				Contacts with Program Personnel And Personnel from Other Agencies			Grand Total (Parent Contacts Plus Non-Parent Contacts)
	Home Visits	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	
Jones Memorial	2	101	54	157	197	139	336	493
Liddonfield, Advent Lutheran	*							
Lutheran Sett.	*							
Macedonia Bapt.	41	160	212	413	283	272	555	968
Marshall School	*							
Meredith School, United Neigh.	97	110	113	320	304	360	664	984
Meth. Church Advocate	16	118	156	290	186	212	398	688
Metropolitan Bapt.	27	246	66	339	152	152	304	643
Moore Memorial, Clara Baldwin	*							
Most Blessed Sacra.	57	0	40	97	0	17	17	114
Mother of Sorrows	3	210	245	458	117	107	224	682
Nativity/Thankful Bapt.	3	20	15	38	34	37	71	109
Nebinger	30	567	541	1,138	84	83	167	1,305
New Thankful	8	189	110	307	103	83	186	493
Norris Square, St. Lukes	71	327	131	529	254	125	379	908
Open Door/Johnson Homes	2	44	39	85	37	44	81	166

TABLE C-3

GET SET DAY CARE

TYPES OF PARENT AND NON-PARENT CONTACTS
MADE BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS 1976-1977

Sites	Contacts with Parents				Contacts with Program Personnel And Personnel from Other Agencies			Grand Total (Parent Contacts Plus Non-Parent Contacts)
	Home Visits	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	
Parkside YMCA	21	401	347	769	169	228	397	1,166
Potter School	34	104	83	221	48	103	151	372
Reformation Luth.	0	549	220	769	442	307	749	1,518
Ressurection	9	252	224	485	213	126	339	824
St. Barnabas	1	162	170	333	164	131	295	628
St. Bartholomew	27	194	131	352	341	254	595	947
St. Joseph	19	26	159	204	53	288	341	545
St. Mary	10	233	69	312	367	69	436	748
St. Matthew	0	555	295	850	181	153	334	1,184
St. Paul	21	30	189	240	46	275	321	561
St. Philip's/Vine Memorial	22	355	155	532	93	159	252	784
St. Stephen	3	120	195	318	268	228	496	814
St. Vincent, Trinity United	0	90	45	135	66	66	132	267
Sarah Allen	94	195	285	574	216	292	508	1,082
Seventh St. Meth.	14	358	154	526	161	104	265	791
Tabernacle Luth.	2	284	249	535	222	145	367	902

C-8

37

38

TABLE C-3

GET SET DAY CARE

TYPES OF PARENT AND NON-PARENT CONTACTS
MADE BY SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS 1976-1977

Sites	Contacts with Parents				Contacts with Program Personnel And Personnel from Other Agencies			Grand Total (Parent Contacts Plus Non-Parent Contacts)
	Home Visits	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	Phone Contacts	Center Contact	Total	
Thankful Bapt.	8	189	110	307	103	83	186	493
Third Christian	*							
Tindley Temple	7	190	152	349	379	226	605	954
Wayland Temple	32	118	98	248	91	72	163	411
Wilson Park	4	73	62	139	151	169	320	459
Wynnfield	4	84	83	171	135	33	168	339
YMCA (Christian)	6	232	76	314	209	145	354	668
Zion Hill	4	458	139	601	239	135	374	975
TOTAL	1,184	12,564	9,672	23,420	10,564	9,919	20,485	43,905

APPENDIX D

GET SET DAY CARE HEALTH SERVICES COMPONENT
1976-1977

Health services in the Get Set program encompass nutritutional, medical/dental, speech/hearing and psychological services. These four service areas are primarily directed to the 4500 children in the program, although the services extends to the parents of the children in the form of health education. Health services for 1976-1977 will be discussed and summarized under two general areas: physical health (includes medical/dental and speech/hearing information) and mental health (primarily psychological, but will also include speech and hearing information). The objectives in the health service delivery are (1) the identification, correction, and alleviation of health problems, (2) the utilization of health agencies and (3) the provision of health education. Nutritional services (assuring that each meal in the center includes a portion of the U. S. Recommended Daily Allowance for each appropriate age group) will not be discussed, although a meal and 2 snacks are provided daily to the children.

Findings

Physical examinations were conducted for 2959 (66%) of the children. Table I indicates that from the examinations/screenings, approximately 759 (17%)[1] of the children were diagnosed as needing health care. Eleven categories of health problem areas were identified with dental problems being the most frequently occuring problem found (i.e., 54% of those diagnosed as needing care). Other areas were - vision (14%) chest (11%), skin (8%), nutrition (5%) and other (ear, defective speech, orthopedic, hernia, nose/throat and nervous/other conditions) (8%). Of the total number of

---

[1] Children may have had multiple health problems, however, the information submitted were by health problem area and not by number and type of health defect per child.

children diagnosed with a health problem, 38% were treated by either a private physician, health clinic or in another health setting. Of those treated, 68% received service at a health clinic; 25% by a private physician and the remaining 7% in other settings.

All children diagnosed with skin, defective speech, orthopedic, hernia, nose/throat and nervous/other conditions, received and completed their treatment programs. Diagnosis of the other health defects resulted in the following percentages of treatment completions: chest (98%), nutrition (82%), ear (15 of 19)[1], vision (56%), and dental (37%).

TABLE 1

HEALTH DEFECT	NUMBER DIAGNOSED	HEALTH FACILITY			TOTAL	TERMINATED	
		PHYSICIAN	CLINIC	OTHER		NUM.	PER.
Dental	412	14	--	--	14	14	3
Vision	109	9	52	--	61	61	56
Chest	82	22	58	--	80	80	98
Skin	61	20	36	5	61	61	100
Nutrition	39	3	14	15	32	32	82
Ear	19	--	15	--	15	15	15/19
Defective Speech	14	--	6	1	7	7	--
Orthopedic	9	--	6	--	6	6	--
Hernia	5	--	5	--	5	5	--
Nose/Throat	4	--	4	--	4	4	--
Nervous/Other	5	5	--	--	5	5	--
Total	759	73	196	21	290	290	38%

[1] Percentages were not computed for N less than 25.

Program data suggests that psychological services focused on four groups of people, i.e., children, parents, staff and community members. Table 2 displays the number of special needs children who received psychological care. Observations were conducted within the classroom and were provided to 15% of the total population. Forty-nine percent of the children observed, were subsequently evaluated (approximately 9% of the total population). Referral or treatment problems were grouped into four areas and are listed below:

TABLE 2

Number of Children with Special Needs
Who Were Observed, Evaluated and Referred
and Treated for Care

Source of Service Need	Evaluated Problem Areas					
	Observations	Speech	Hearing	Dev. Hnd.[1]	Problem[2]	Total
Pre-Admission	--	--	--	--	35	35
Recruitment	--	--	--	38	--	38
In-site Classroom	--	53	32	34	203	322
Total	655	53	32	72	238	395

[1] Developmental Handicapped

[2] Physically aggressive behavior or social-emotional maladjustment

Table 3 reports the type and total number of contacts (N=1046) made by the psychological staff. The majority of the contacts were with instructional staff (63%), followed by contacts with instructional staff in special classes (20%).

TABLE 3

Type and Number of Contacts
Engaged by Psychological Services Staff
For Children with Special Needs

Types of Contacts	No. of Contacts		No. of Individuals Involved
Instructional Staff	655	63%	1115
Special Class Inst. Staff	212	20%	(unknown)
Parent Conferences	95	9%	517
Casereview	84	8%	420[1]
Total	1046	100%	2052

1. Estimated number involved in case review.

The psychological staff also conducted 154 parent conferences in group or in individual settings. Two-thirds of these parent contacts were to discuss the child's developmental problem. The remaining one-third was made by staff serving as a resource person in general parent meetings.

TABLE 4
Number of Parent Contacts by Psychological Staff

Types of Contacts	No. of Conferences
Parent Conferences	95
Resource Person	59
Total	154

The psychological staff further conducted staff training, served as consultants for the social service staff and facilitated implemented of education models. Table 5 indicates that 2191 consultations were made with other program personnel. Half of the consultations were with the Social Service Staff, with another 39% of the consultations with instructional personnel.

TABLE 5

Number of Consultations Engaged
With Program Personnel

Purpose of Contact	No. of Consultations	
Staff Training:	208	9%
Instructional Staff	(188)	
Special Class Staff	(6)	
Child Abuse and Neglect	(14)	
Routine Classroom Observations	843	39%
Montesorri Method	39	2%
Consultant for Social Services	1101	50%
	2191	101%

In conjunction with the delivery of staff training by the psychological staff, the latter received staff training through workshop, seminars and through routine staff meetings. (see Table 6 below)

TABLE 6

Staff Training Available to
Psychological Staff

Method of Staff Training	Psychologist	Psychological Assistant
Staff Meetings	--	27
Workshop/Seminars	11	31
Total	11	59

Table 7 indicates that the psychological staff also provided services (755 contacts) to the community in the form of establishing and maintaining agency contacts (97%) and in undertaking observations requested by community agencies (3%).

TABLE 7

Type and Number of Services
Provided by Psychological Staff to the Community

Method of Community Service	No. of Contacts
Request for Observations	6
Establishing and Maintaining Agency Contacts	649
Total	755

Four objectives were established for the psychological staff. One objective was omitted during the year as the function was transferred to the Day Care Training Office. The three applicable objectives are:

1. To implement by October, 1976 a training and follow-up process for all administrative, all social service, and all center staff which will sensitize these employees to incidences of child abuse and enable each employee to take positive, corrective measures.

   TARGET : 1075 program personnel (N=1079-4)
   ACCOMPLISHMENT : 1068 (99%)
   OBJECTIVE ACHIEVED: No

2. To increase the psychological services staff's participation in parent meetings by 50 percent for 1976-77 calendar year. During 1975-76, staff participated in 30 parent meetings.

   TARGET : 45 parent meetings
   ACCOMPLISHMENT : 59 parent meetings
   OBJECTIVE ACHIEVED: Yes

3. For the psychological services staff to visit each center during 1976-77 calendar year for the purpose of on-site conferences with staff.

TARGET : 92 centers
ACCOMPLISHMENT : 90 centers (99%)
OBJECTIVE ACHIEVED: No

Although two of the three objectives were not achieved 100%, in both cases, the objectives were achieved 99%. Overall, it may be viewed that the psychological staff has achieved its objectives and has served children, parents, staff and community, in the manner indicated in the proposal.

Social Services workers were also involved in the health service component. Of the 537 contacts made about a child's health, referrals constituted 91% of the contacts. Home visits, which made up 9% of the contacts, were primarily made for the child's physical health needs. (See Table 8). Also, as a separate service, 38 children in 5 special classes were provided transportation services.

TABLE 8

Health Services Provided
By Social Services Workers

Area of Health	Home Visit	Referrals		Total	
Child's Physical Health	46	334	68%	380	71%
Child's Mental Health	—	157	32%	157	29%
Total	46	491	100%	537	100%

SUMMARY

Get Set Day Care provides health services to 4500 children as part of the daily program. As of May, 1977, two-thirds of the children had received physical examinations/screenings, and 17% of those children were diagnosed as having a physical health problem. Over half of the children diagnosed were in need of dental care. The other major areas requiring care were vision, chest, skin, and nutrition. Of all children diagnosed with a problem, 38% received and completed their treatment program.

Psychological (including speech and hearing) services (mental health) were also provided. In addition to achieving the objectives for the year, the staff observed 15% of the children, and with pre-admission and recruitment activities, evaluated 9% of the children in the program. The major problem identified was "problem behavior" (physical agressive behavior or social-emotional maladjustment). The psychological staff worked with parents and program personnel who were directly involved with special needs children. The contacts with parents were primarily to assist the parent in better understanding their child's developmental problem. The contacts made with program personnel were: (1) consultation services to social service workers and instructional personnel, (2) conducting routine observations, and (3) providing staff training. Services to the community concentrated on establishing and maintaining contact with community agencies.

Social service workers also assisted in the implementation of health services to children, by conducting home visits and or making referrals to community agencies.

APPENDIX E GET SET DAY CARE STAFF DEVELOPMENT 1976-1977

This analysis is based on returns from 84 teachers and 48 aides, who represent 45% of the 291 instructional staff surveyed. (This was a sample of approximately three persons per site.) Seven of elevel supervisors surveyed also returned completed questionnaires.

ATTENDANCE AT STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

As can be seen from Table 1, the major types of staff development workshops Get Set teachers participated in were: program-sponsored staff development sessions (61%), local school staff development including faculty meetings (56%) and Title XX Day Care staff development (51%).

Assistants and aides do not appear to have taken advantage of workshops as did aides in other programs (Table 2). Forty-eight percent (48%) attended Title XX Day Care workshops, 42% attended program-sponsored workshops and 40% attended local school/center staff development including faculty meetings.

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISORY SUPPORT (Tables 3 and 4)

Fifty-five percent (55%) of the teachers indicated that they had on-site consultations with supervisory staff at least once a month, but 46% had no on-site teaching assistance throughout the year, and 29% had no workshop sessions. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the assistants and aides had on-site consultations with supervisory staff at least once a month, but 46% had workshops and 31% had on-site teaching assistance less than once a month. Forty-six percent (46%) also indicated that they had no on-site teaching assistance throughout the year.

SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISORY SUPPORT (Tables 5 and 6)

The majority of Get Set teachers indicated that they were satisfied with 8 of the 10 listed services supervisory and support personnel provided. Those services which were most satisfactory were: 1) offering support in parent involvement, 2) giving support to individual concerns, 3) providing program information; and providing support in solving classroom management problems. The two services which were least satisfactory were: 1) on-site classroom training and 2) conducting workshops.

The majority of assistants and aides were also satisfied with 8 of the 10 listed services provided by supervisory and support personnel. The two most satisfactory services were giving support in parent involvement and working out concerns about individual children. The least satisfactory were on-site classroom training and arranging the use of professional days.

Supervisors indicated that they spent most of their time on providing program information, giving support in solving classroom management problems and in working out concerns about individual children.

IMPACT OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ON CLASSROOM EFFECTIVENESS (Tables 7 and 8)

Teachers were asked to indicate to what degree they felt the various types of staff development changed classroom effectiveness. The most effective areas in rank order were staff development in: 1) child abuse and neglect, 2) learning disabilities; child growth and development, 3) social behaviors, 4) using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum, 5) making effective use of physical space, and 6) curriculum development.

Assistants and aides felt that the most effective areas were: 1) classroom management, 2) using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum; social behaviors; and curriculum development.

FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT (Tables 9-14)

The majority of Get Set teachers (69%) indicated that they preferred no one single mode of staff development, but rather some of each, i.e. on-site consultations, workshop sessions, and on-site teaching assistance. The three most preferred areas for future staff development were: 1) curriculum development, 2) using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum and 3) social behaviors. Most also indicated that they would be willing to participate in staff development in these and a number of other areas without reimbursement. The least preferred areas for future staff development for 80% or more of the teachers were: 1) model related training, 2) helping children take tests and 3) making effective use of physical space.

The majority of assistants and aides also preferred no one single mode of staff development. The three most preferred areas for future staff development were: 1) using the creative arts to enrich the curriculum, 2) social behaviors, and 3) classroom management. Most assistants and aides indicated a willingness to participate in these and many other staff development areas without reimbursement. The least preferred areas for future staff development were: 1) helping children take tests, 2) model related training, and 3) making effective use of physical space.

Supervisors had three priority areas for future staff development: 1) human relations, 2) parent involvement, and 3) child development.

TABLE 1

GET SET DAY CARE

TEACHERS (N=84)

NUMBER OF WORKSHOPS ATTENDED BY TYPE

Frequency	Community Agency %	Health Facility %	Local School Staff %	Program Sponsored %	City Wide Sch. Dist. %	District ECE Program %	Teacher Center %	Profess. Organiz. %	University or College %	Title XX Day Care Service %
No Response	30	27	19	17	24	24	23	30	23	17
1 to 5 Sessions	26	37	21	45	26	24	34	29	17	39
6 to 10 Sessions	2	4	18	11	4	0	5	2	4	4
Over 10 Sessions	2	1	17	5	4	1	2	0	13	8
Never	39	31	25	23	43	52	36	39	44	32

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 2

GET SET DAY CARE

EXTENT TO WHICH AIDES (N= 48) ATTENDED AT LEAST 1 WORKSHOP

Facility	Percent
Community (Gov't Agency PAAC, PARC, etc.)	23
Health Care Facilities	25
Local School Staff Development Days (1/2 Day or Faculty Meeting)	40
Program-Sponsored Staff Development	42
City-Wide School District In-Service Course	27
District Early Childhood Program	36
Teacher Centers (Durham, Advisory Center, Community Resources)	15
Professional Organizations	17
University or College	37
Day Care Services & Other Title XX Programs	48

TABLE 3

GET SET DAY CARE

TEACHERS (N=84)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISORY SUPPORT

Frequency	On Site Consultations %	Workshop Sessions %	On Site Demonstrations Teaching Assistance %
No Response	4	6	7
Less than 1/Month	30	46	36
1/Month	24	14	2
Biweekly	14	1	1
Weekly	17	4	7
Never	12	29	46

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 4

GET SET DAY CARE

ASSISTANTS AND AIDES (N-48)

AMOUNT OF SUPERVISORY SUPPORT

Frequency	On Site Consultations %	Workshop Sessions %	On Site Demonstrations Teaching Assistance %
No Response	6	8	8
Less than 1/Month	27	46	31
1/Month	25	13	4
Biweekly	15	6	4
Weekly	23	6	6
Never	4	21	46

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 5

GET SET DAY CARE

TEACHERS (N=84)

SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES PROVIDED BY
SUPPORT/SUPERVISORY/RESOURCE
PERSONNEL

Services Provided	Generally Satisfied %	Generally Not Satisfied %	No Response %	Rank
Conducts Workshops	46	39	14	9
Informs You of Program Information, Decisions, and Procedures	71	19	9	3.5
Gives Suggestions About the Effective Use of Curriculum Materials	69	24	7	6
Locates Available Resource Materials	56	38	6	7
Provides On-Site Classroom Training	30	58	12	10
Gives Support in Solving Classroom Management Problems	71	19	9	3.5
Gives Support to Individual Concerns	76	17	7	2
Offers Support in Parent Involvement	80	12	8	1
Arranges Use of Professional Days	52	36	12	8
Gives Support in Working Out Concerns About Individual Children	70	24	6	5

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 6

GET SET DAY CARE

ASSISTANTS AND AIDES (N=48)

SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES PROVIDED BY
SUPPORT/SUPERVISORY/RESOURCE
PERSONNEL

Services Provided	Generally Satisfied %	Generally Not Satisfied %	No Response %	Rank
Conducts Workshops	63	27	10	6
Informs You of Program Information, Decisions, and Procedures	52	25	23	7.5
Gives Suggestions About the Effective Use of Curriculum Materials	67	19	15	4
Locates Available Resource Materials	52	29	19	7.5
Provides On-Site Classroom Training	33	38	29	10
Gives Support in Solving Classroom Management Problems	69	17	15	3
Gives Support to Individual Concerns	65	17	19	5
Offers Support in Parent Involvement	71	15	15	1.5
Arranges Use of Professional Days	48	27	25	9
Gives Support in Working Out Concerns About Individual Children	71	10	19	1.5

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 7

GET SET DAY CARE

TEACHERS (N=84)

EXTENT TO WHICH STAFF DEVELOPMENT
RESULTED IN GREATER CLASSROOM EFFECTIVENESS

Area of Staff Development	Little Change %	Moderate Change %	Great Change %	No Response %	Rank
Social Behaviors	26	48	11	15	2.5
Parent Involvement	45	36	7	12	8.5
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	31	34	21	13	4
Growth and Development Issues	30	40	18	12	2.5
Community Resources	46	32	8	13	10.5
Curriculum Development	34	38	15	12	6
Classroom Management	39	34	13	13	7
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	33	37	18	12	5
Model/Option Related Training	55	19	1	25	15
Helping Children Take Tests	62	11	2	25	16
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skill Readiness	40	33	7	19	10.5
Learning About Commercial Materials	51	27	4	18	14
Individualizing Instruction	39	32	12	17	8.5
Learning Disabilities	48	23	13	17	12
Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect	19	31	39	11	1
Using Teacher Center Facilities	48	23	12	18	13

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 8

GET SET DAY CARE

ASSISTANT AND AIDES (N=48)

EXTENT TO WHICH STAFF DEVELOPMENT
RESULTED IN GREATER CLASSROOM EFFECTIVENESS

Area of Staff Development	Little Change %	Moderate Change %	Great Change %	No Response %	Rank
Social Behaviors	17	48	19	17	3
Parent Involvement	23	52	6	19	7
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	15	44	23	19	3
Growth and Development Issues	21	38	21	21	6
Community Resources	33	40	4	23	12
Curriculum Development	17	46	21	17	3
Classroom Management	15	40	29	17	1
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	21	42	21	17	5
Model/Option Related Training	46	25	2	27	15
Helping Children Take Tests	42	23	4	31	16
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skill Readiness	27	38	10	25	9
Learning About Commercial Materials	42	29	2	27	14
Individualizing Instruction	21	33	19	27	8
Learning Disabilities	35	31	8	25	13
Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect	35	27	19	19	11
Using Teacher Center Facilities	29	33	15	23	10

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 9

GET SET DAY CARE

TEACHERS (N=84)

TYPE OF PREFERRED STAFF DEVELOPMENT

	Percent
On Site Consultations	8
Workshop Sessions	9
On Site Demonstrations	11
Some of Each	69
None At All	1
No Response	1

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 10

GET SET DAY CARE

ASSISTANTS AND AIDES (N=48)

TYPE OF PREFERRED STAFF DEVELOPMENT

	Percent
On Site Consultations	8
Workshop Sessions	10
On Site Demonstrations	8
Some of Each	67
None At All	0
No Response	6

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 11

GET SET DAY CARE

TEACHERS (N=84)

PREFERRED AREAS FOR FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Area of Staff Development	Preferred %	Not Preferred %	No Response %	Rank
Social Behaviors	52	26	21	3
Parent Involvement	36	40	24	9
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	68	21	11	2
Growth and Development Issues	48	32	20	6
Community Resources	21	52	26	12
Curriculum Development	69	20	11	1
Classroom Management	49	27	24	4
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	20	49	31	14
Model/Option Related Training	19	61	30	16
Helping Children Take Tests	18	55	27	15
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skill Readiness	43	31	26	5
Learning About Commercial Materials	21	50	29	13
Individualizing Instruction	39	36	25	7.5
Learning Disabilities	39	30	31	7.5
Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect	24	46	30	11
Using Teacher Center Facilities	25	49	26	10

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 12

GET SET DAY CARE

TEACHERS (N=84)

AREAS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN WHICH TEACHERS WOULD PARTICIPATE WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT

Area of Staff Development	Willing %	Not Willing %	No Response %	Rank
Social Behaviors	57	15	27	6.5
Parent Involvement	57	19	24	6.5
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	69	14	17	1
Growth and Development Issues	62	12	26	3
Community Resources	43	27	30	11
Curriculum Development	67	14	19	2
Classroom Management	61	18	21	4,5
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	39	29	31	12
Model/Option Related Training	30	32	38	15
Helping Children Take Tests	34	33	32	13.5
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skill Readiness	52	17	31	9.5
Learning About Commercial Materials	34	31	34	13.5
Individualizing Instruction	56	15	29	8
Learning Disabilities	61	11	29	4.5
Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect	21	46	31	16
Using Teacher Center Facilities	52	17	31	9.5

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 13

GET-SET DAY CARE

ASSISTANTS AND AIDES (N=48)

PREFERRED AREAS FOR FUTURE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Area of Staff Development	Preferred %	Not Preferred %	No Response %	Rank
Social Behaviors	65	19	17	2
Parent Involvement	29	48	23	8.5
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	69	17	15	1
Growth and Development Issues	50	25	25	5.5
Community Resources	17	48	35	11
Curriculum Development	50	17	33	5.5
Classroom Management	54	19	27	3
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	10	52	37	14
Model/Option Related Training	8	46	46	15
Helping Children Take Tests	6	54	40	16
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skill Readiness	52	21	27	4
Learning About Commercial Materials	12	56	31	13
Individualizing Instruction	29	35	35	8.5
Learning Disabilities	31	29	40	7
Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect	19	44	37	10
Using Teacher Center Facilities	15	44	42	12

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

TABLE 14

GET SET DAY CARE

ASSISTANTS AND AIDES (N=48)

AREAS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN WHICH ASSISTANTS AND AIDES WOULD PARTICIPATE WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT

Area of Staff Development	Willing %	Not Willing %	No Response %	Rank
Social Behaviors	60	17	23	5
Parent Involvement	48	27	25	12
Using the Creative Arts to Enrich the Curriculum	73	10	17	1
Growth and Development Issues	54	21	25	6.5
Community Resources	35	33	31	13
Curriculum Development	65	17	19	3.5
Classroom Management	67	19	15	2
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	50	31	19	10
Model/Option Related Training	27	37	35	16
Helping Children Take Tests	29	33	37	15
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skill Readiness	65	15	21	3,5
Learning About Commercial Materials	33	31	35	14
Individualizing Instruction	52	17	31	8
Learning Disabilities	54	21	25	6.5
Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect	50	21	29	10
Using Teacher Center Facilities	50	23	27	10

* Due to rounding, percentages may not always equal 100%.

APPENDIX F

GET SET DAY CARE PARENT INVOLVEMENT
1976-1977

The State guidelines for day care encourage parent participation in Get Set. Parents are informed about opportunities for classroom participation by social workers during child interviews and at parent meetings. Policy and non-policy making bodies exist but are not mandated under Title XX guidelines. Get Set has a Parent Council at each center which plans activities for parents and children. There are also Area Councils and a City-wide Parent Council made up of two representatives from each center. Their functions are to plan educational activities and develop parent leadership to merge school and community together. Parent workshops are conducted by some centers.

This year a Quarterly Parent Involvement Questionnaire was used to gather data about three major aspects of parent involvement. Data were collected for three quarters from September 1976 through May 1977. The questionnaires were completed by head teachers and social workers, each contributing part of the information.

According to the data, the Center Parent Councils spent a great deal of time fund raising, planning social activities, and participating in educational activities (see Table 1).

Get Set parents were reported to have volunteered a total of 25,562 hours providing an average of 315 hours per center per quarter (see Table 2). Classroom participation amounted to 3,707 hours yielding an average of 46 hours per center per quarter. Parents spent most of their volunteer time attending general meetings and workshops. A second level of emphasis was placed on classroom participation, helping with class trips, and doing volunteer work

at home. The least amount of time was spent on other activities and planning policy.

A total of 5,377 hours were spent in workshops with an average of 66 hours per center per quarter. Parents of the centers attended from zero to six educational workshops with an average of one educational workshop per center per quarter. For all types of workshops, parents of the centers reported attended between zero and twenty-one, with an average of three workshops per center per quarter (see Table 2).

TABLE 1

Get Set
Function of Main Parent Group

	No Response	Not Applicable	Little or No Time	Moderate	Great Deal of Time
Making Input into Policy Decisions, Budget, etc.	2.4*	40.2	23.2	28.0	6.1
Participating in and/or Planning of Educational Activities/Trips	2.4	2.4	32.9	46.3	15.9
Attending Sessions in: Home Economics, Nutrition Home Budgeting, Sewing, etc.	4.9	31.7	46.3	15.9	1.2
Planning Social Activities	8.5	6.1	22.0	46.3	17.1
Fund Raising (Cake Sales, Bazaars, Book Fairs, etc.)	2.4		14.6	52.4	30.5
Other Functions	67.1	9.8	2.4	11.0	9.8

* Table entrees reflect percentages. Each row does not always total 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 2

GET SET DAY CARE VOLUNTEER HOURS AND WORKSHOPS
1976-1977

PROGRAM SITES	Total Number Of Quarters Reported	Volunteer Hours						Workshops			
		Workshop Hours		Class Participation		All Volun. Hours		Educational Workshops		Workshops	
		Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter
Advent	1	0	0	25	25	223	223	0	0	0	0
Allegheny	1	0	0	120	120	268	268	0	0	0	0
Bartram	1	150	150	7	7	195	195	1	1	4	4
Berean	1	126	126	16	16	151	151	0	0	0	0
Bethune	2	553	277	50	25	1452	726	5	3	9	4
Bright Hope Dunbar	1	2	2	4	4	65	65	1	1	1	1
Calvary Epis	3	30	10	20	7	125	42	1	0	3	1
Childs Mem.	1	75	75	24	24	191	191	1	1	2	2
Church of God	1	0	0	0	0	13	13	0	0	0	0
Clara Baldwin	2	11	6	184	92	385	193	1	1	2	1
Cookman	1	180	180	200	200	680	680	3	3	3	3
Coretta King	2	86	43	22	11	605	303	1	1	4	2
Cornerstone	1	856	856	450	450	2565	2565	4	4	17	1
Corpus Christ	1	655	655	408	408	3183	3183	2	2	12	12
Crucifixion	3	0	0	38	13	312	104	0	0	0	0
Emmanuel (York)	2	0	0	22	11	127	64	0	0	0	0
Emmanuel (Brown)	1	0	0	10	10	110	110	0	0	0	0
Friends Guild	2	24	12	22	11	194	97	1	1	4	2

TABLE 2 (continued)

GET SET DAY CARE VOLUNTEER HOURS AND WORKSHOPS
1976-1977

PROGRAM SITES	Total Number Of Quarters Reported	Volunteer Hours						Workshops			
		Workshop Hours		Class Participation		All Volun. Hours		Educational Workshops		Workshops	
		Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter
Good News	1	0	0	0	0	71	71	0	0	0	0
Grace Lutheran	1	60	60	75	75	390	390	0	0	2	2
GreaterZion		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harrison Plaza	2	44	22	34	17	265	133	0	0	0	0
Haverford	1	0	0	54	54	129	129	0	0	0	0
Holy Cross	2	109	55	160	80	933	467	2	1	5	3
House of Prayer	3	24	8	90	30	601	200	0	0	1	0
Janes Meth.	1	0	0	0	0	360	360	0	0	0	0
Johnson Homes	2	20	10	80	40	297	145	2	1	2	1
Jones Memorial	1	28	28	10	10	70	70	0	0	3	3
Lutheran Settlement	1	0	0	4	4	181	181	0	0	0	0
Macedonia Baptist	2	134	67	90	45	893	447	1	1	5	3
Methodist Church of the Adv.	1	21	21	20	20	68	68	2	2	3	3
Metropolitan	1	150	150	3	3	170	170	1	1	3	3
Moore	2	109	55	50	25	422	211	3	2	9	5
Mt. Pisgah	1	175	175	40	40	485	485	6	6	21	21
Mt. Zion Baptist	1	0	0	90	90	119	119	0	0	0	0
Nebinger	2	3	2	0	0	129	65	1	1	1	1

TABLE 2 (continued)

GET SET DAY CARE VOLUNTEER HOURS AND WORSHOPS
1976-1977

PROGRAM SITES	Total Number Of Quarters Reported	Volunteer Hours						Workshops			
		Workshop Hours		Class Participation		All Volun. Hours		Educational Workshops		Workshops	
		Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter	Total	Mean Per Quarter
New Thankful	1	0	0	7	7	280	280	0	0	0	0
Open Door	2	4	2	0	0	59	30	1	1	1	1
Reformation Lutheran	1	44	44	60	60	792	792	0	0	2	2
St. Barnabas	2	71	36	9	5	273	137	3	2	9	5
St. Bartholomew	1	28	21	144	144	362	362	0	0	5	5
St. Joseph	2	230	115	60	30	770	385	2	1	7	4
St. Matthew	1	25	25	20	20	445	445	0	0	4	4
St. Paul	3	195	65	190	63	1029	343	1	0	7	2
St. Phillip	2	66	33	0	0	147	74	2	1	3	2
St. Stephen	3	29	10	326	109	885	295	3	1	4	1
Sarah Allen	2	150	75	150	75	1216	608	0	0	3	2
Seventh St. Methodist	1	0	0	15	15	90	90	0	0	0	0
Wayland Temple	2	383	192	115	58	1162	581	1	1	13	7
Wilson Park	3	26	9	33	11	152	51	0	0	17	6
Wynnefield	2	501	251	106	53	1333	667	1	1	13	7
YMCA	1	0	0	50	50	140	140	0	0	0	0